

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-8062

THE CITY OF
COLUMBUS

ANDREW J. GINTHER, MAYOR

DEPARTMENT OF
DEVELOPMENT

MEETING SUMMARY

date

February 28, 2019

place

Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room

111 North Front Street, Room 204

time

4:00pm – 7:05pm

present

Frank Petruziello, Kerry Reeds, Pasquale Grado, Keoni Fleming

absent

Doreen Uhas Sauer, Steven Papineau, Kay Bea Jones

A.

4:06

Business of the Board

1.

motion by

Motion

Vote

Approval of Meeting Summary from January 24, 2019

Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Reeds

To approve the meeting summary as submitted.

4-0

B.

Applications for Certificate of Approval

1.

address:

60 East Norwich Avenue

Multi-Family

app no.:

UID_19-01-007

applicant:

Chad Mooney / Robert Corwin

reviewed:

Windows

4:10 – 4:21

Recusal:

None

Staff Report:

- **Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.**
- **Mr. Mooney and Corwin presented the proposal and the windows.**

discussion:

- **Mr. Petruziello asked how the storm windows would work.**
- **Mr. Mooney said they were interior glass storm windows with a rubber seal.**
- **Mr. Grado asked if they met egress requirements.**
- **Mr. Corwin said they had not yet looked into it.**
- **Mr. Petruziello told them to return with elevations and shop drawings.**
- **Mr. Grado said they needed measured drawings depicting exactly what they were proposing.**
- **Mr. Fleming asked them to bring shop drawings from the manufacturer.**
- **Mr. Petruziello asked how many opening types there are on the building.**
- **Mr. Mooney said there were seven.**
- **Mr. Petruziello said to bring a drawing of each of the seven types of windows, shop drawings showing their proposal for using the windows in each type, and elevations showing them in context. Their solution is reasonable, but the Board needs to see it explicitly.**

motion by

motion

vote

Tabled

2. address

214 East 16th Avenue

Single Family

app no.:

UID_19-01-006

applicant:

Bob Mickley/Chadwiche Rice T&T Windows

reviewed:

Windows

4:21 – 4:32

Recusal:

None

Staff report:

- **Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.**
- **Mr. Mickley presented the proposal.**

discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked if the windows on the proposed list included vinyl. • Mr. Teba replied that it did not. • Mr. Fleming asked what windows were currently on the building. • Mr. Mickley said the upper floors had storm windows. The lower floor had original wood window casements. • Mr. Fleming asked if they were planning on replacing them in kind with casements. • Mr. Mickley said they wanted to do single hung windows • Mr. Grado said he did not feel the casements were original. • Mr. Fleming asked if it was student housing. • Mr. Mickley said it was Buckeye Real Estate. • Mr. Petruziello stated that they needed to return with buildings elevations showing the windows in the proposed locations. • Mr. Mickley asked if they were ok not doing casements on the front. • Mr. Petruziello said that the casements were not necessary. However the windows above the porch did not look to be the right size as they appeared too wide for old windows. Perhaps they should look at putting two windows in each opening above the porch.
motion by Motion	Tabled
Vote	
4. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 4:32 – 4:45 Recusals: Staff Report:	<div> <div>1980 North High Street</div> <div>Charley's</div> </div> <div> <div>UID_09-02-014</div> <div>Stanley Young</div> </div> <div> <div>Graphics</div> <div>None</div> </div> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Smith presented the proposal
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello said the sign they were proposing was not approvable. It says wings-steak-fries and is an internally illuminated box. • Mr. Smith stated that the current sign was internally illuminated, and there were other examples of products on signage in the area. • Mr. Fleming replied that the existing sign is not advertising product, and any current internally illuminated signs predate the board. • Mr. Petruziello added the board offered a concession when they approved the previous articulated internally illuminated box. • Mr. Teba stated that the location of the current projecting sign would interfere with the Evolved sign. • Mr. Petruziello said the gooseneck lighting was inappropriate, but a linear fixture with LED's lighting Chic Harley from the bottom could work. • Mr. Grado suggested the projecting sign be to the left of the wall sign. • Mr. Petruziello agreed. He added that the applicant should figure out how to mount the projecting sign at the mortar joints, and mimic the sign approved on the face.
Motion by: Motion	Tabled
Vote:	

3. address	1976 North High Street	Ad-Mural
app no.:	UID_09-02-013	
applicant:	David Hodge/ Orange Barrel Media	
reviewed:	Graphics	
4:45 – 5:10		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:		
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Hodge presented the proposal • Mr. Petruziello asked about copyright on the temporary murals. • Mr. Hodge said they were all approvable by the Wesner Center. • Mr. Fleming asked if the extension was due to not being able to lease out the space to another entity. • Mr. Hodge said that it was not. He wants to extend it through the end of July because the sign is acceptable and serves a beneficial purpose. • Mr. Grado stated that Mr. Hodge indicated he was personally applying in 2017, yet the COA's have Orange Barrel Media on them as well. • Mr. Hodge replied that although he was the applicant, he later struck a deal with Orange Barrel. • Mr. Petruziello said that the minutes had to reflect that the applicant is David Hodge Acme Googaw LLC. • Mr. Reeds stated that if what is approved today is only for Mr. Hodge, then there isn't a problem. • Mr. Grado said that there was problem. The underlying owner of the wall is Mr. Hodge and Orange Barrel. • Mr. Petruziello said that was beyond the Board's purview. The application runs with the dirt, not with the person. • Mr. Fleming agreed that the COA was for 1976 North High Street. The content on the sign is past the agreed upon terms. Either the Board could extend the existing sign or we make the applicant take it down and put up a temporary mural. • Mr. Hodge said that in fairness the year term is arbitrary. The sign is appropriate and serves multiple purposes. • Mr. Petruziello moved to approve the application with conditions. • Mr. Grado asked if Mr. Hodge would agree that only David's LLC. would appear on the COA. • Mr. Hodge agreed to that. 	
Motion by:	Mr. Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Reeds	
Motion	<p>To approve with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the existing mural for two months. (April 28, 2019) • Approve the temporary murals with staff's conditions. • Only the applicant's name as shown on the application be shown on the COA. 	
Vote:	4-0 to approve	
5. address	2106 North High Street	White Castle
app no.:	UID_09-02-017	
applicant:	Stanley Young	
reviewed:	Graphics	
5:10 – 5:15		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Tom Branham presented the proposal 	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello stated that the projecting sign should be centered on the Whitecastle wall sign. It should be moved up. 	

Motion by:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Grado felt it wasn't out of scale but needed to be raised. Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Grado
Motion	<p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The sign be moved up such that the center of the sign be level horizontally with the center of the wall sign. • The bolts holding the sign to the wall be covered with an escutcheon plate. • That all electrical be hidden behind the wall with no exposed conduit or wires.
Vote:	4-0 to approve
6. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:15 – 5:35 Recusals: Staff Report:	<div data-bbox="383 543 1110 669"> 112 East 14th Avenue UID_09-02-018 Bradley Blumensheid Addition </div> <div data-bbox="974 543 1110 571">Multi-family</div> <p data-bbox="383 707 444 735">None</p> <div data-bbox="394 741 1511 1934"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Blumensheid presented the proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming asked if they were rebuilding the dormers. • Mr. Teba said that they were. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the applicant wanted to narrow the dormer. • Mr. Blumensheid said they did, as well as redo the east dormer, and add a dormer on the west. • Mr. Petruziello asked if they were rebuilding the whole roof with a new pitch. • Mr. Blumensheid confirmed they were. • Mr. Reeds asked if anything vented out the chimney. • Mr. Blumensheid replied that he wasn't exactly sure. • Mr. Fleming added that from a zoning standpoint the staff issues were one parking space and the % of rear landscape percentage. He asked if they were under FAR. • Mr. Teba replied that if his calculations were correct, they were. The windows were also a concern. • Mr. Fleming asked what the pitch of the roof was. • Mr. Blumensheid replied that they were going from a 6 or 7/12 pitch to an 8/12. By increasing the pitch, they could improve the appearance of the dormers. • Mr. Reeds stated that he was concerned that the chimneys would be too short to function once the roof pitch was modified. • Mr. Blumensheid stated that the rear chimney was being removed. • Mr. Fleming said he was ok with the pitch of the roof changing, but he was on the fence about the second story porch. • Mr. Grado said they should just have a porch without the roof. • Mr. Fleming agreed. • Mr. Petruziello agreed and said that perhaps an awning could be incorporated. • Mr. Blumensheid asked if they had comments regarding the rear addition. • Mr. Petruziello stated that it appeared the overhangs had been clipped and appeared greater than two feet. • Mr. Fleming stated that the rear upper story windows do not align with the lower windows and are in the line of support. • Mr. Petruziello asked if they couldn't move the columns. • Mr. Blumensheid thought that was possible. • Mr. Fleming said the west elevation, on the first floor, was a bit blank and could use a little relief. • Mr. Petruziello asked if they needed egress on the dormer windows. Perhaps they should make the center dormer windows wider. • Mr. Blumensheid stated that he was ok using a window from the approved list on the existing </div>
discussion:	

	portion of the building, but would prefer to use vinyl on the rear.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming said the Board would have to work through that idea and get back to the applicant.
Motion by:	
Motion	Conceptual Review
Vote:	

7. address	1524-1598 North High Street	Gateway
app no.:	UID_09-02-019	
applicant:	David A. Keyser / DKB Architects	
reviewed:	Graphics	
5:35 - 5:49		
5:58 - 6:08		
Recusals:	Mr. Fleming recused himself.	
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Keyser, Ms. Prosser, and Ms. Moffa presented the proposal 	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked if they weren't creating an attractive nuisance in terms of people slapping it. • Mr. Reeds said students could climb or hang on it. • Mr. Grado said he would prefer that the sign was something other than what they were proposing. • Mr. Petruziello stated that they all felt a sign was warranted, but not this sign. • Ms. Prosser said the sign was reflective of the Gateway brand. • Ms. Moffa said the sign was inspired by European signs showing arrows in different directions. • Mr. Petruziello stated that what they were proposing was a little too cute. He feared it was a ladder people would climb. • Mr. Grado asked if it couldn't be two posts. He liked the European connection. • Mr. Petruziello said that if they made a truly pedestrian sign that was at scale and within reach in a European style, then that solves the pedestrian issue. Couldn't they then do something on the building for vehicular traffic? • Mr. Reeds asked if it couldn't be incorporated into some sort of art bench that people could sit around. Something that would make people congregate. Something that wouldn't be stand alone. • Ms. Prosser said that it didn't have to be stand alone. • Mr. Keyser said that elevations showed that the sign wasn't out of scale. • Mr. Reeds added that he liked that there was some rhythm to it, it allowed individuality to the different blades along the post. He loved the neon along the top. 	
Motion by:		
Motion	Lack of quorum	
Vote:		

C. Applications for Zoning, Code Enforcement and/ or Conceptual Review

1. address	207 West 8 th Avenue	Multi-Family
app no.:	UID_19-02-02	
applicant:	Jeffrey Tyndall	
reviewed:	Slate Roof Removal	
5:49– 5:58		
Recusals:	None	
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. 	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming indicated he agreed with staff and felt the conditions were a reasonable compromise. Tear off the shake style stuff and replace with a slate like shingle with metal roll across the top. • Mr. Petruziello stated that he supported staff's recommendation. 	

- Mr. Fleming asked if the roof work had been permitted.
- Mr. Tyndall indicated that it was supposed to be, but it wasn't. They found out about the COA after they went in for the permit. He added that many buildings along this street have the same type of shingles on their roofs, without the ridge runners.
- Mr. Petruziello said that this is only about his building no other building. Those are different cases.
- Mr. Fleming said that the timeline of events speaks to the fact that they weren't operating in the best faith.
- Mr. Tyndall replied that the roof had already been completed by the time they were issued the stop work order.
- Mr. Fleming replied that the Board existed and covers an area. If they allow anyone to ignore the bylaws of the Board, then the Board means nothing. The staff member's recommendations are reasonable.

Motion by: **Mr. Petruziello / Mr. Reeds**

Motion: **To approve the proposal with the following conditions.**

- Shingles be replaced with a slate-like shingle from the approved shingle list.
- All hips and ridges to be capped with galvanized metal ridge roll, not cut shingle tabs.
- All ridge roll is to extend to the ridge edges (i.e., flush with the fascia).
- All metal ridges, valleys, and flashing are to be painted "Tinner's Red" or "gray" to match shingles as closely as possible.

Vote: **4-0 to approve**

E.	7:00- 7:02	Staff Issued Certificates of Approval	
		Lack of a quorum	Items approved:
F.	7:02-7:04	Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval	
		Lack of a quorum	items approved COA issued